Applicant(s): Thomas C. Prentice et al.

U.S.S.N.: 09/928,112

## **REMARKS**

In response to the Office Action dated March 27, 2003, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration. The application is believed to be in allowable condition.

In the Office Action, it was suggested that the title of the present application be changed to more clearly reflect the invention to which the claims are directed. Accordingly, the title of the invention has been changed and the title accurately reflects the invention of the present application.

Claims 1-13, 25, 30, and 33 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as failing to point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claims 8-13, 25, 30, and 33 have been canceled without prejudice, rendering rejection of these claims moot. Claim 1 has been amended to overcome the 112, second paragraph rejection, and is presented in allowable condition. Claims 2-7 depend, directly or indirectly from claim 1, and are patentable for at least the reasons that claim 1 is patentable.

The claims have been objected to for lacking clarity in use of the terminology "material dispensed". The claims have been reviewed for proper antecedent basis and amended where appropriate to address the objections, and the claims are believed to be in allowable condition.

Claims 1, 6, 22 and 30 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,906,682 (Bouras). Claims 22 and 30 have been canceled without prejudice rendering rejection of these claims moot. As discussed below, independent claim 1 has been amended and is patentable over the cited reference.

Claim 1 is directed to a dispensing system for dispensing a material onto a substrate. The dispensing system includes a dispensing element having a metering device that controls a quantity of the material dispensed from the dispensing element to the substrate, and a calibration device to calibrate the quantity of the material dispensed. The calibration device includes a dish that receives the material from the dispensing element during a calibration routine of the dispensing system, the dish including a conical protuberance extending from a center portion of the dish.

Bouras discusses a dispensing system for dispensing a viscous material onto a substrate. The dispensing system has a dispensing element and a weigh scale to receive a representative weight of material for a predetermined time interval so that a flow rate can be calculated. The

Applicant(s): Thomas C. Prentice et al.

U.S.S.N.: 09/928,112

speed of the dispensing element is adjusted according to the calculated flow rate. The material is collected in a platen of the weigh scale when it is weighed.

In contrast to claim 1, Bouras does not teach or suggest a calibration device having a dish that receives a material from a dispensing element during a calibration routine of the dispensing element. Nor does Bouras disclose a dish including a conical protuberance extending from a center portion of the dish, as is recited in claim 1. Accordingly, claim 1 is patentably distinguishable over Bouras, and the rejection of claim 1 should be withdrawn. Claim 6 depends indirectly from claim 1, and is patentable for at least the reasons discussed with respect to claim 1.

Claims 2-5, 7, and 31-33 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bouras in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,836,315 (Lee). Lee discloses a weighing scale having a series of notches along the balance beam and a ball moved from notch to notch to serve as a poise; however, Lee does not overcome the deficiencies of Bouras, discussed above with respect to claim 1. Claims 31-33 have been canceled without prejudice rendering rejection of these claims moot. Claims 2-5 and 7 depend, directly or indirectly, from claim 1, and are patentable for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 1.

Claims 8-13, 23-25, and 33-36 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bouras. Claims 8-13, 23-25, and 33-36 have been canceled without prejudice rendering rejection of these claims moot.

Claims 8, 23, and 33 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bouras in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,837,892 (Cavallaro). Claims 8, 23, and 33 have been canceled without prejudice rendering rejection of these claims moot.

Applicants note the addition of new claims 37-53. No new matter is presented in the additional claims.

Applicant(s): Thomas C. Prentice et al.

U.S.S.N.: 09/928,112

The application as presented is believed to be in allowable condition, and Applicants respectfully request a favorable examination. To answer any questions, or otherwise further the prosecution of this application, the Examiner may contact the undersigned attorney at the number provided below.

Respectfully submitted,

A. Jason Mirabito, Esq. (Reg. No. 28,161)

Alison L. Marcotte, Esq. (Reg. No. 51,998)

MINTZ, LEVIN, COHN, FERRIS,

GLOVSKY and POPEO, P.C.

One Financial Center

Boston, MA 02111

Attorneys for Applicants

Telephone: (617) 542-6000

Facsimile: (617) 542-2241

Date: July 28, 2003

TRA 1816458v1